

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
10

11 MICHAEL HOLTSINGER,

12 Plaintiff,

No. CIV S-03-0732 MCE CMK P

13 vs.

14 J.M. BRIDLE, et al.,


15 Defendants.

ORDER

16 _____/
17 On March 21, 2005, plaintiff filed a request for reconsideration of the magistrate judge's
18 order filed March 9, 2005, mooted the January 26, 2005 motion to compel (doc. 68). Pursuant
19 to E.D. Local Rule 72-303(f), a magistrate judge's orders shall be upheld unless "clearly
20 erroneous or contrary to law." Upon review of the entire file, the court finds that it does not
21 appear that the magistrate judge's ruling was clearly erroneous or contrary to law.

22 Therefore, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that, upon reconsideration, the order of the
23 magistrate judge filed March 9, 2005, is affirmed.

24 DATED: April 18, 2005

25 
26 MORRISON C. ENGLAND, JR.
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE